



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,638	02/20/2004	Tomoko Adachi	00862.100124.	3438
5514 7590 04/13/2009 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
GELAGAY, SHEWAYE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,638

Applicant(s)

ADACHI, TOMOKO

Examiner

SHEWAYE GELAGAY

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Applicant's amendment filed on December 23, 2008.
2. Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19-20 are amended. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on December 23, 2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 8-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: The term "configured to" in the claim language brings ambiguity if such action would be rendered by the device. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20 recite "the

determining unit determines that the entered user identification information corresponds to the first type of user even if it is the first time that the first type of user causes the device to perform the login process," that is not disclosed in the application as filed. The applicant in the original specification at the time of the filing has not described the claimed limitation. The examiner requests the applicant to provide the exact paragraph in the specification that supports the amendment "determining unit determines that the entered user identification information corresponds to the first type of user even if it is the first time that the first type of user causes the device to perform the login process."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (hereinafter Kondo) US 5,684,957 in view of Snapper et al. (hereinafter Snapper) U.S. Patent No. 7,216,292 and in view of Onuki US 2003/0074343.

As per claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20:

Kondo discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer-executable program for implementing a data processing method for

displaying, on a data processing device, an entry screen for entering user identification information and password information, comprising the steps of:

storing, in a storage unit, user identification information and password information for each of a plurality of users, the user identification information and the password information being associated with each other;

setting information whether to hold user identification information which is to be used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen;

allowing a display unit to display the user identification information that is set to be held at said setting step on the entry screen;

entering, on the entry screen, user identification information and password information;

wherein the user identification information is entered in the entering step in a case where any of the displayed user identification information is selected (4:60-5:4 wherein a general user and privileged user constitute two types of users, 17:29-55 wherein a privileged user is the user type in which the login history is held without needing to be set and a general user's history is not automatically held).

Kondo does not explicitly disclose causing a holding unit to hold login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the determining unit determines that the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user even if it is the first time that the first type of user causes the device to perform the login process, and to control to request the user to set the

information whether to hold the login history in a case where the determining unit determines that the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user. Snapper in analogous art, however, discloses causing a holding unit to hold login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the determining unit determines that the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user even if it is the first time that the first type of user causes the device to perform the login process, and to control to request the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the determining unit determines that the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user. (col. 16, lines 24-line 61; *the user would be prompted to indicate whether the username/password should be stored or not for future use...the next time that user visits the same web site, he or she would not be prompted again*) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Kondo with Snapper in order to set for a user to allow a login history to be left in order to reduce the redundant information users must enter when logging into a system as taught by Snapper (3:10-21).

Both references do not explicitly disclose user type information indicating whether each of the plurality of users corresponds to the first type of user or the second type of user; a determining unit configured to determine whether the entered user identification corresponds to the first type of user or the second type of user based on

the user type information stored in the storage unit. Onuki in analogous art, however, discloses user type information indicating whether each of the plurality of users corresponds to the first type of user or the second type of user; a determining unit configured to determine whether the entered user identification corresponds to the first type of user or the second type of user based on the user type information stored in the storage unit. (paragraph 142-168) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Kondo and Snapper with Onuki in order to provide a system that determines a user type and store personal information of the individual in the storage part. (paragraph 154; Onuki)

As per claims 2 and 11:

The combination of Kondo, Snapper and Onuki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said setting means provides user interface for allowing a user to set whether to leave a login history or not on a login screen presented to the user at a login operation (figs. 4A-C).

As per claims 4 and 13:

The combination of Kondo, Snapper and Onuki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said login histories are administered so as not to contain information on a user for a plurality of times (16:16-35).

As per claims 5 and 14:

The combination of Kondo, Snapper and Onuki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said authentication information contains classification information for classifying each user as the first type or the second type, and wherein said holding means holds login histories for each of said first type and said second type (15:54-65).

As per claims 7 and 16:

The combination of Kondo, Snapper and Onuki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said setting means automatically sets login histories to be held for the users set as said first type and provides user interface allowing the users set as said second type to set whether to leave a login history or not on a login screen presented to the user at the login operation (15:54-65).

2. Claims 3, 9, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (hereinafter Kondo) US 5,684,957 in view of Snapper et al. (hereinafter Snapper) U.S. Patent No. 7,216,292 and in view of Onuki US 2003/0074343 and further in view of Capps, U.S. Patent No. 5,666,502.

As per claims 3, 9, 12 and 18:

The combination of Kondo, Snapper and Onuki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. None of the references do explicitly disclose setting the number of users whose login histories are held and then holding that many. However, Capps discloses setting the number 5 as the amount of names that can be held in the database (11:1-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to set a limit to the amount of names to be stored since if too many are accumulated it can be difficult for the user to make a selection quickly as taught by Capps (2:1-13).

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 6 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWAYE GELAGAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437